

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent Number 7,076,730, one of the parents of this application. A terminal disclaimer is included herewith, thereby overcoming this rejection.

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Microsoft Outlook 98 for Windows and NT. Claims 1-13 and 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Wilhelm. Claims 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Wilhelm in view of Reed. Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Malkin.

On Tuesday May 29, 2007, the undersigned and attorney David P. Gordon spoke by telephone with Supervisory Patent Examiner Lynn D. Feild. The applicant and her attorneys wish to thank Examiner Feild for her careful review of this application and its prosecution history which spans over seven years. Examiner Feild expressed the opinion that she was only concerned with the double patenting issue and the Microsoft Outlook reference and that if the applicant filed a terminal disclaimer and amended the claims to overcome the Outlook reference, the application would be allowed. A terminal disclaimer has been filed. Thus, the only remaining issue is how to amend the claims to overcome the Outlook reference.

Examiner Feild suggested that after her thorough review of the application she believed that the gist of the invention was controlling how much of an email message is viewable by the recipients of the message. The applicant's attorneys agreed that this feature of the authoring modes described in the application was an important feature, but suggested that another important feature was limiting the types or number of tools that a user can use to create a message. It was generally agreed that if the independent claims were amended to focus on these two features (not necessarily in the same claim), the claims would distinguish over the prior art.

A proposed amendment of independent claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 19, and 22 was submitted by fax to the Examiner. On July 17, 2007, the undersigned spoke by telephone with the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that she and a representative from Quality Review had considered the proposed amendment with the following conclusions: proposed claim 1 is too vague; proposed claims 8 and 11 are allowable; proposed claim 14 might be allowable if a suitable definition(s) of "role mode" can be found in the specification; proposed claim 19 is too broad in the opinion of Quality Review; and claim 22 might be allowable on the same condition as claim 14. The Examiner suggested that the Applicant submit a second proposed amendment addressing the issues discussed on July 17, 2007.

Claim 1 has been amended to make it more like claim 8 in terms of a “subset of information contained in the message.” It is believed that the version of claim 1 presented herein is allowable.

Claims 8 and 11 appear herein as they did in the first proposed amendment and are allowable.

Claim 14 specifies that “the role mode” determines how much information in said email message will be displayed. The specification discusses “role mode” in several places. It is mentioned on the first page in the field of the invention. It is discussed on page 7 in reference to the parent application. It is described on page 9 in the objects of the invention. It is described on pages 10 and 11 in the summary of the invention. It is illustrated in Figs. 6-10 and described in the description of those figures. See, in particular, pages 35-49 of the specification.

Claims 19-21 have been canceled.

On August 21, 2007, the undersigned spoke by telephone with Supervisory Patent Examiner Lynn D. Field who indicated that this amendment would put all of the claims in condition for allowance.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain

outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas A. Gallagher
Reg. No. 31,358
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
60 Long Ridge Road
Suite 407
Stamford, CT 06902
Tel: (203) 323-1800
Fax: (203) 323-1803

September 5, 2007